

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5). The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4). The disclosure was objected for an informality. Claim 21 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c). Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 14, 20, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 5,365,303 to Yamasaki et al. (herein "Yamasaki"). Claims 3, 4, 6, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamasaki in view of U.S. patent 5,335,032 to Onuki et al. (herein "Onuki"). Claims 5, 15, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamasaki in view of U.S. patent 5,331,365 to Miyazawa et al. (herein "Miyazawa"). Claims 7 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamasaki in view of Miyazawa and further in view of Onuki. Claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamasaki in view of Onuki and further in view of Miyazawa.

Addressing the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4) noted in paragraph 1 of the Office Action, that objection is traversed by the present response as the specification is amended by the present response to now recite reference sign 240.

Addressing the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4) noted in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, that objection is traversed by the present response as a substitute drawing is submitted herewith in Figure 12 properly labels the X-axis.

Addressing the objection to the disclosure noted in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, that objection is traversed by the present response as the specification is amended by the present response to now properly refer to Figure 1 at page 4, line 8.

Addressing the objection to claim 21 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c), claim 21 is canceled by the present response.

Addressing the rejection of claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, that objection is traversed by the present response.

More particularly, those claims are amended by the present response to now provide clear antecedent basis for all terms.

Addressing now each of the outstanding rejections based on prior art, each of those rejections is traversed by the present response.

Each of the outstanding prior art rejections is based on the primary reference to Yamasaki. However, Yamasaki is not believed to recite the features now clarified in the claims.

Each of independent claims 1 and 13 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now further recites “a deviation correcting device including a positionable, optical element configured to be repositioned based on tilt angles calculated by the calculator”. In such ways, independent claim 1 incorporates limitations similar to those recited in both of previously pending dependent claims 2 and 8. It is also noted that independent claim 13 is similarly amended. Such a feature is shown, as non-limiting examples, in Figures 14 and 15 in the present specification. More specifically, Figure 14 shows the use of a correction lens 122 and Figure 15 shows the use of a vari-angle prism 65. According to features clarified in the claims, each of the correction lens 122 or the vari-angle prism 65 can be positioned based on calculated rotation angles. Thus, the correction lens 122 and the vari-angle prism 65 can be utilized to compensate for tilting resulting from shaking of a camera. Such features clarified in the claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The outstanding Office Action cites several portions in Yamasaki with respect to teaching moving lenses or compensating for camera shaking. The outstanding Office Action specifically indicates that Yamasaki discloses at column 7, lines 20-25, that lenses 14a and 14b are moved in response to a camera shaking. However, applicants note that with respect to Figure 4, Yamasaki discloses that the effective position of lenses 14a and 14b is moved when a camera shakes, see also column 7, lines 20-25. However, that movement of lenses 14a, 14b is based on the camera shaking, and is not based on rotation angles calculated by the calculator. More specifically, in Figure 4 Yamasaki discloses that when a camera shakes, lenses 14a and 14b are resultingly moved. Such teachings in Yamasaki are not related to the features clarified in the claims. Specifically, in the claims the deviation correcting device includes a positionable optical element that essentially operates to correct for a camera shaking. In Figure 4, Yamasaki does not disclose lenses 14a and 14b moving to correct for a camera shaking, instead Yamasaki merely discloses, in an explanatory manner, that a camera shaking results in those lenses moving. In Figure 4 the lenses 14a and 14b are not moved based on a calculated rotation angle; the movement is only the result of the camera shaking.

Further, with respect to the teachings in Yamasaki of rotating the image sensor table 216, it is noted that independent claims 1 and 13 now recite two different operations of both a rotation regulator and a deviation correcting device. No teachings in Yamasaki with respect to moving the image sensor table 216 are directed to the “deviation correcting device” now also recited in the claims.

In such ways, each of independent claims 1 and 13, and the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to clearly distinguish over the teachings in Yamasaki.


Moreover, no teachings in Miyazawa or Onuki are believed to overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Yamasaki.

Thus, each of the pending claims is believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number

22850

Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

I:\ATTY\SN\0557\05574757\05574757-AM.DOC